

were to elect the members of this House it would be in fact the people of the Provinces that would elect us and then would be fulfilled these expressions of the fathers of Confederation that this upper House is to represent sectional interests and especially the Provinces. Senators were grouped by groups of twenty-four, so that the Provinces would balance one another. By the proposed mode of election the Provinces would have a voice in this upper Chamber; we would be really the representatives of the Provinces—the other House is representative of the people and by that means we would have a much desired equilibrium, an equilibrium which is the ideal of all constitution makers from the times of remotest antiquity to the present moment—hon. gentlemen will admit that such a balance of powers does not exist in our Legislature. As to senators in the United States being elected by the caucus as the leader says, I would like to be allowed to state that it is provided by the constitution of the United States that should a vacancy occur in the Senate before the meeting of the Legislature, the Executive has power to fill it, and it comes practically and theoretically to the purport of my motion, that Senators should be appointed by the Local Legislatures. The hon. leader referred to the fact that we had tried the elective system and after ten years' trial had abandoned it. I would remind him that we also adopted after the union a nominative system and after trying it for a certain number of years we abandoned it. My proposition goes between the two. We have had an experience of a nominative House which has proved a failure. We have had a council elected directly by the people which has proved unworkable. I come in with a motion proposing a scheme between the two, such as has been adopted by civilized people the world over and which has been proved practicable everywhere it has been tried. I propose a system that we have not tried yet in this country, and I feel confident that ere long we will have to try it. The day will come when a change in the constitution of the Senate will be demanded and may be forced upon us; and it is more dignified for us beforehand to take up the question and deal with it ourselves than to wait until the demand is made on us by the people. I am no prophet, nor am I

the son of a prophet, but I foresee the day when—not in this century of course but in the 20th century—the Liberals will come into power, and this House will be composed altogether of members of one political party. Then, what will be our position? That gratitude which weighs so heavily on the bosom of my hon. friend which weighs on us all, will be an object of suspicion, at least, to the Liberal Government when they come into power. We will not be slaves of course; but we will be under the moral influence of that gratitude to the extent that with the best of intentions we will be severe in dealing with Bills brought up by the other political party; and should we then reject some of those Bills, a cry and howl will be raised throughout the country against us of such a nature that we shall have to yield and not gloriously. What I propose is that we should deal with the matter now and in a dignified manner. I see that the majority are against me, but I wish hon. gentlemen should understand that the move I have made is not inimical to the Senate nor to the Government. I agree with what the leader of the Government has said, that, constituted as we are, there is hardly any justification for us having here Cabinet Ministers with portfolios. The Minister of Justice or the President of the Council might occupy seats in this House, but under the existing system I do not see how the other Ministers could hold seats in the Senate, because, as I have said, the voice of the people hardly reaches us—and our voice is not listened to by the people. My hon. friend from Victoria (B. C.) challenged me to show a case in any other country where a Ministry has been overthrown by a vote of the upper House. I will not again enter into a review of the Governments of other countries, but I will just call attention to the fact that in France, although the Ministry are not supposed to fall on an adverse vote in the upper House, the last Ministry—the Tirard Ministry, fell on an adverse vote in the upper House, showing that the moral influence of the French Senate was sufficient to bring about the resignation of a very powerful Ministry. It shows what moral weight the Senate of France has. On the other hand, the Senate of the United States are holding their own, as they do in Switzerland, Belgium and all other countries where the upper